Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/051,460	FOX ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emmanuel Sayoc	3746
All Participants:	Status of Application: Pe	ending
(1) Emmanuel Sayoc.	(3)	
(2) Phyllis Kristal.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 30 January 2004	Time: <u>2:30pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	•
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
35 U.S.C. 102b WO 99/14471 to Sanderson, 35 U.S.C. 1036 Forster (U.S. 4,449,444)	a Sanderson in view of Goto et al. (U.	S. 5,931,645), 35 U.S.C. 103a
Claims discussed: 1, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 40, 44, 5	55, and 56	
Prior art documents discussed: 35 U.S.C. 102b WO 99/14471 to Sanderson, 35 U.S.C. 1036 Forster (U.S. 4,449,444)	a Sanderson in view of Goto et al. (U.	.S. 5,931,645), 35 U.S.C. 103a
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	. The examiner will provide a writ ate record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	cant/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the interview the examiner identified three features that would make any of the independent claims allowable i) non-rotatable piston cylinders, ii) pistons having different diameters or cylinders having different working volumes, and iii) independently adjustable piston strokes (piston travel).

claim 30 was identified as being allwable.

The concept of differing stroke needs to the clarified.

Claim 44 depends on a cancelled claim.

Sanderson teaches a device aubstantially similar to the calimed invention. Sanderson differs in that there is no teaching of using pistons of different diameters or cylinders of different working volumes.

103a Sanderson in view of Goto et al. In Figure 1 Goto et al. teaches the use of pistons of different diameters. Goto et al. teaches that it was well known to use different working volume cylinders in order to arrive at different compression levels in a multistage compressor. Fluid is gradually compressed for better efficiency in achieving high levels of compression. Varying amounts of cylinder volume achieves varying levels of compresion throughout the multistage compression. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sanderson by incorporating the varying cylinder volumes in order to achieve varying levels of compression throughout the multistage compression.

103 a Forster. Fist the examiner pointed out that another motivation for having different diameter pistons is to have the ability to compress multi fluids at different levels independent of each other.

In a lower compression of capacity requirement, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known that the number of cylinders can be reduced in Forster. For example in a low compression capacity requirement, one outer cylinder and one inner cylinder can be used. Preserving the stroke adjustment teaching of Forster, one would be able to independently adjust the stroke of the outer piston relative to the inner piston.

The examiner stated that Forster can be overcome by stating that the cylinders do not rotate.

Applicant agreed to amend the claims according to the identified allowable material. .